AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) Attorney Docket No.: Q85589

U.S. Application No.: 10/520,125

REMARKS

In the present Amendment, the specification has been amended to correct a typographic error. New claim 11 has been added. Section 112 support for claim 11 is found, for example, in claim 1 and at page 4, lines 13-17 of the specification. No new matter has been added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-11 will be pending.

Initially, the Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents on Form PTOL-326, which the Examiner has indicated at page 2 of the Detailed Action of December 10, 2008.

In paragraph No. 6 of the Action, claims 1-4 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shimamura et al (US 6,090,505) in view of Ehrlich (US 2003/0064291).

Applicant submits that this rejection should be withdrawn because Shimamura et al and Ehrlich do not disclose or render obvious the present invention, either alone or in combination.

In the Amendment filed August 22, 2008, Applicant explained that the "Sn₂Ni₃ phase" disclosed at page 4, lines 4 to 7 of the specification is not cited as an example of the "Sn phase;" rather, it is cited as an example of "crystalline phases or noncrystalline phases other than Sn₄Ni₃ phases and Sn phase." Therefore, Shimamura et al does not teach or suggest that the alloy contains the Sn₄Ni₃ phase and the <u>Sn phase</u>, as required by the present claims.

In response, the Examiner states:

... the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., see p. 4, paragraph

2 of Applicant's Remarks) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) Attorney Docket No.: Q85589

U.S. Application No.: 10/520,125

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

However, Applicant did not intend to call for reading limitations from the specification into the claims. Rather, Applicant was trying to correct the Examiner's misunderstanding that the Sn phase included Sn_2Ni_3 .

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily understood that the "Sn phase" in present claim 1 does not include Sn₂Ni₃, even without reading the disclosure at page 4, lines 4-7 of the specification, for the following reasons.

If "Sn phase" in claim 1 contains Sn₂Ni₃, it would include Sn₄Ni₃ as well. Then, every alloy including Sn₄Ni₃ phase would always include a Sn phase. Thus, the language "and Sn phase" in the recitation "said alloy contains Sn₄Ni₃ phase and Sn phase" of claim 1 would be meaningless to one of ordinary skill in the art in his understanding of that part of claim 1. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have any alternative but to conclude, when reading the recitation "said alloy contains Sn₄Ni₃ phase and Sn phase" of claim 1, that "Sn phase" does not include Sn₂Ni₃ and Sn₄Ni₃, but indicates a phase consisting almost exclusively of Sn. Therefore, the recitation "Sn phase" in claim 1 indicates a phase consisting almost exclusively of Sn, and does not include Sn₂Ni₃ as disclosed by Shimamura. This would be readily apparent to persons skilled in the art upon reading present claim 1. Of course, claims are to be read and interpreted as they would be by persons skilled in the art.

The Examiner further states:

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the negative active material taught by Shimamura containing 57

Attorney Docket No.: Q85589

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) U.S. Application No.: 10/520,125

atomic % Sn (see Shimamura, Table 2(A), Sample No. 66) includes solid phases Ni₃Sn₄, Ni₃Sn₂, and a pure Sn phase [emphasis added] (see Ni-Sn (Nickel-Tin) of *Journal of Phase Equilibria and Diffusion*).

However, the negative active material taught by Shimamura does not include a pure Sn phase, as explained below.

It is true that an alloy containing 57 atomic % Sn includes a pure Sn phase if the molten alloy is sufficiently slowly cooled to solidify. However, that is not always true when the alloy is rapidly cooled, since it solidifies before the separation of phases takes place in accordance with the phase diagram.

As the Examiner indicates, if the negative active material taught by Shimamura includes a pure Sn phase, Shimamura would have disclosed Ni₃Sn₄, Ni₃Sn₂ and a pure Sn phase as components of the negative electrode materials. However, Shimamura discloses only Ni₃Sn₄ and Ni₃Sn₂ as components of the negative electrode materials. This clearly indicates that the negative active material taught by Shimamura does not include a pure Sn phase.

Ehrlich is cited as teaching a negative electrode material comprising about 5 to 90 wt% nickel particles and about 10-95 wt% tin particles (abstract). Ehrlich does not make up for the deficiencies of Shimamura et al.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-4 and 8-10 based on Shimamura et al in view of Ehrlich are respectfully requested.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)

U.S. Application No.: 10/520,125

Attorney Docket No.: Q85589

In paragraph No. 7 of the Action, claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

allegedly being unpatentable over Shimamura et al in view of Ehrlich, and further in view of

Tsutsue et al (US 2002/0006548).

Applicant submits that this rejection should be withdrawn for essentially the same

reasons that the previous rejection of claims 1-4 and 8-10 based on Shimamura et al in view of

Ehrlich should be withdrawn. Tsutsue et al is cited as teaching a layer of electrode active

material mixture having a porosity of 30 to 60% (abstract). Tsutsue et al does not make up for

the deficiencies of Shimamura et al and Ehrlich.

New claim 11 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that

claims 1-10 are patentable over the cited references, as discussed above.

Allowance is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner

feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly

requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 57,426

Hui C. Wauters

Him Chen Wanters

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 11, 2009

12